



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

a tendency of the Pennsylvania courts in all cases to give the words "I guarantee payment" the same meaning that is attached to them in other jurisdictions, viz., "I promise to pay if the principal debtor defaults". *Bloom v. Warder* (1882) 13 Neb. 476, 14 N. W. 395; *First Nat'l Bank of Hibbing v. Schürmer* (1916) 134 Minn. 387, 159 N. W. 800; *Miller v. Northern Brewery Co.* (D. C. 1917) 242 Fed. 164; *Galbraith v. Shores-Mueller Co.* (1918) 178 Ky. 688, 199 S. W. 779; *Pfeiffer v. Crossley* (1918) 91 N. J. L. 433, 103 Atl. 1000, *aff'd* (1919) 92 N. J. L. 638, 106 Atl. 892; 12 R. C. L. § 13; Stearns, Suretyship (2nd ed.) §§ 61, 62.

TRUSTS—CONSTRUCTIVE TRUST—USE OF TRUST FUND BY GUARDIAN.—Where a guardian borrowed money from X and with the loan purchased land from Y, taking title to himself, and subsequently diverted trust funds in his possession to repay the loan, *semble*, equity will impress a trust character on the land if the guardian at the time he acquired title had the intention subsequently to divert his ward's funds to repay the loan. *Hardy v. Hardy* (Ga. 1919) 100 S. E. 101.

The general rule is that a trust will not arise on other than the state of facts existing when the property is acquired. *Dick v. Dick* (1898) 172 Ill. 578, 50 N. E. 142; *Woodside v. Hewel* (1895) 109 Cal. 481, 42 Pac. 152; see *Botsford v. Burr* (N. Y. 1817) 2 Johns. Ch. \*405, \*409; 1 Perry, Trusts (6th ed.) § 133. After the legal title has once vested in the grantee of a deed, a trust cannot be raised so as to divest that legal estate by the subsequent application of the funds of a third person to pay the unpaid purchase money. *Myers v. Myers* (1900) 47 W. Va. 487, 35 S. E. 868; *French v. Sheplor* (1882) 83 Ind. 266; *McCall v. Flippin* (1872) 61 Tenn. 161; *cf. McDevitt v. Frantz* (1889) 85 Va. 740, 751, 8 S. E. 642. In the principal case it would hardly be contended that a trust was impressed upon the land immediately upon its purchase by the guardian, since he might never have carried into effect his intention of diverting the *cestui's* funds to repay the loan. But it is maintained that the dictum in the instant case is nevertheless correct, since the injury to the *cestui*, which became cognizable by the courts only when his funds were diverted, had its inception in the act of the trustee in acquiring the land, coupled with his then intent to defraud the *cestui*. There is an analogous doctrine in many cases of conspiracy, for although it has often been held that conspiracy exists as a substantive tort, *Evans v. Freeman* (C. C. 1905) 140 Fed. 419; *Collins v. Cronin* (1887) 117 Pa. 35, 11 Atl. 869; see *Patnode v. Westernhaver* (1902) 114 Wis. 460, 90 N. W. 467; 5 Columbia Law Rev. 233, it seems that the right of action does not arise until some act injuring the plaintiff has been committed in furtherance of the objects of the conspiracy. *Schwab v. Mabley* (1882) 47 Mich. 572, 11 N. W. 390; see *Fleitmann v. United Gas Improvement Co.* (1916) 174 App. Div. 781, 783, 161 N. Y. Supp. 650. And there is no novelty in the doctrine of relating back to a pre-existing intent an act insufficient in itself to cause the impression of a trust. For where by statute an oral declaration of trust is void as to realty but valid as to personalty, if land is conveyed on parol trust to hold the proceeds, and the land is sold, the trust will be enforced as to the proceeds of the sale. *Chace v. Gardner* (1917) 228 Mass. 533, 117 N. E. 841; see *Watson v. Payne* (1910) 143 Mo. App. 721, 128 S. W. 238; 18 Columbia Law Rev. 375.